

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAROLD COURTNEY JARVIS,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
MARCUS POLLARD,  
Respondent.

No. 2:20-cv-00480 KJM GGH P

ORDER

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On September 29, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty-one days. ECF No. 20. Neither party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court


////

1 . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be  
2 supported by the record and by the proper analysis, and adopts the magistrate judge’s threshold  
3 recommendation that the Petition be dismissed as time-barred.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations filed September 29, 2020, are adopted in full;
- 6 2. Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 9) is granted;
- 7 3. The Petition (ECF No. 1) is dismissed with prejudice because it is barred by the  
8 AEDPA statute of limitations; and
- 9 4. The court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C.  
10 § 2253.

11 DATED: March 31, 2021.

12  
13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28